Chairman Siciliano called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m., welcoming the Commissioners, staff, and guests.

It was moved and seconded that the minutes of the April 25 meeting of the Commission be approved. The motion passed unanimously.

Chairman Siciliano briefly reviewed the Commission chronology, noting that the process of building a memorial in the monumental core of the Nation’s Capital is both prescribed and regulated by federal statute (1986 Commemorative Works Act.) He noted that as part of this process he had appeared before the NCMC and requested an Area I designation for the Eisenhower Memorial, a request which was unanimously approved and presented to the Secretary of the Interior.
The Chairman introduced John Parsons, Associate Regional Director, National Park Service, and requested that he update the Commission on the legislative process and the status of the Area I designation request.

Mr. Parsons stated that Congress had established a long and deliberate process, making it difficult to build a memorial in the District's monumental core. He explained the meaning of the Area I and Area II designations. He then presented to the Commission a September 12, 2002 letter from the Secretary of the Interior, recommending that Congress approve Area I designation for an Eisenhower Memorial.

Mr. Parsons congratulated Chairman Siciliano for his close cooperation with the National Park Service. He noted that the Commission has been working in partnership with the NPS. He stated that the clock is now ticking on the 150-day approval period.

Chairman Siciliano next addressed the work of the Eisenhower Legacy Committee. He explained that its task is to prepare a paper encompassing the legacy of Eisenhower, and identifying its salient characteristics and achievements for the purpose of memorialization, in three areas: his presidency, his military career, and his lifetime of public service. He referred to Dwight D. Eisenhower as the “most outstanding public servant of the last century.”

The Chairman acknowledged the presence and contribution to the Eisenhower legacy of Prof. Louis Galambos and Dr. Daun van Ee, who served as co-editors of the Eisenhower Presidential Papers, a 25-year project.

Chairman Siciliano then introduced Prof. Galambos as Chairman of the Legacy Committee. Prof. Galambos in turn introduced the committee members present: Prof. Robert Bowie, General Andrew J. Goodpaster (U.S. Army, Ret.), Prof. John R. Morrow, Jr., Dr. Kiron K. Skinner, and Dr. Daun van Ee.

Prof. Galambos explained that the task of the Legacy Committee was to examine a subject about which many books have been written, to extract the essence of Eisenhower's lasting legacy, and to present it in non-technical terms to the general public and to scholars.

Prof. Galambos spoke of the status of the committee’s work following their meetings on the preceding day, September 11, 2002. They had formed three subcommittees and agreed on a mission and schedule. They planned to have a draft report for the Commission in October, consisting of three subcommittee reports, each three pages in length, together with a one-page executive summary. A final report will be completed by December 15. The report will include a sharply defined statement of the Eisenhower legacy.

Commissioner Geduldig asked about the intended audience for the Legacy Committee’s report. Prof. Galambos replied that it would be both for the Commission and the general public. Therefore, the committee would eliminate technical information, assuring that the report would be understood by people without in-depth historical experience or knowledge. It would be short and self-explanatory and would eventually be released to the public with special publicity.

Commissioner D. David Eisenhower noted the importance of the Legacy Committee’s work. He further mentioned a recent television show in which Dwight D. Eisenhower was ranked ninth among American presidents.
Noting that Eisenhower had more than one legacy, General Goodpaster remarked that it was useful that the Legacy Committee had been broken into three subdivisions. The focus of his particular subcommittee (military/security) could further be broken into three periods on the world stage: World War II, the period between the war and Eisenhower’s presidency (in which Eisenhower served as NATO commander), and the military/security focus of Eisenhower’s presidency in which he sought to bring peace with security as well as to promote the expansion of global liberty.

Chairman Siciliano introduced Prof. John H. Morrow, Jr., a member of the Legacy Committee and the nephew of Fred Morrow, an Eisenhower aide and the first African-American professional to work in the White House. Prof. Morrow stated that it was both a pleasure and an honor to serve on the Committee, and he remarked on the fact that this was the first time anyone had made a public connection between him and Fred Morrow. He observed that Eisenhower’s unifying capabilities were paramount to his legacy: Eisenhower, he said, was a “rare individual” who “belongs to the American people.”

Dr. Daun van Ee agreed about the difficulty of summarizing what he called Eisenhower’s triumph of character.

Dr. Kiron F. Skinner discussed the challenge of situating Eisenhower in the American civic and political traditions. She called Eisenhower the ultimate democratic theorist who knew how to make democratic institutions work, while keeping them responsive to American values and the American people.

Prof. Robert Bowie, reflecting on the Eisenhower Administration, called it inspiring to go back over his memories. He offered one caveat regarding the length of the Committee’s report: it should not be too brief to do justice to its subject matter, he cautioned.

Chairman Siciliano again thanked Prof. Galambos and the committee members and said he looked forward to their draft on October 15 and their final report on December 15.

Representative Moore returned to the matter of the statutory 150-day period for congressional response to the Secretary of Interior’s letter. He asked whether the clock would still run on the 150-day period if Congress should adjourn without taking final action on the matter before the 150 days had elapsed. Senator Stevens observed that if Congress should initiate action within the 150 days, there should be no procedural problem that would be insurmountable.

The Chairman turned to the next agenda item — a presentation by several Eisenhower organizations recommending, and making a specific joint-proposal for, a “living memorial.” He stated that a number of Eisenhower organizations, entities, and contemporaries had been invited to attend, and he introduced several who would speak to the Commission on behalf of the proposal: Susan Eisenhower (Eisenhower Institute), Anne Eisenhower (family), Adrian Basora (Eisenhower Exchange Fellowships), and Stewart Etherington (Eisenhower Foundation). The Chairman also acknowledged the presence of several Eisenhower contemporaries in addition to General Goodpaster: Langhorne Washburn, Abbott Washburn, and Brad Patterson.

Susan Eisenhower commended Prof. Galambos, stating that she is looking forward to his full report and stating her belief that it will be extremely useful for the public and all the Eisenhower legacy organizations. She also stated her appreciation of the efforts of the Commission.
Susan Eisenhower said that there are two ways to go forward on a Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial, namely a "bricks-and-mortar" memorial in the manner of the statues of General Pershing and General/President Ulysses S. Grant that exist in the Nation's Capital, and a "living memorial" approach along the lines of the Kennedy Center, the Woodrow Wilson Center, and the Harry S. Truman Scholarship Foundation. She noted that several options are available with respect to a living memorial, that such an approach is a legitimate and vital way to memorialize a person, and that there is more than one way to shape a living memorial. The objective, she said, was to produce a living memorial that is greater and more dynamic than the sum of its parts.

Ms. Eisenhower commended the core capabilities of the Eisenhower organizations represented before the Commission and said that the organizations are capable of generating a significant overall approach to a living memorial. She said that the organizations needed a decision from the Commission before developing a more fully articulated proposal. She requested that the next decision of the Commission respond to the proposal for a living memorial and generate a timeline and methodology if a living memorial should prove to be of interest to the Commission.

Ms. Eisenhower then requested comments from her sister Anne, who stated that the idea of a living memorial has strong support within the Eisenhower family. She asked the Chairman to suggest a timeframe in which the Commission would respond to their proposal.

Chairman Siciliano replied that the Commission would consider their proposal quickly.

Senator Stevens asked Susan Eisenhower to explain why she framed the choice of a "bricks-and-mortar" memorial versus a "living memorial" as an either-or choice: must it be one or the other? The Kennedy Center, he observed, is both a physical and living memorial. If the Commission were to decide on a process of memorialization that would include both "physical" and "living" elements, would the Eisenhower organizations represented before the Commission desire to be part of that process?

Anne Eisenhower stated that the Kennedy Center is a living memorial as distinguished from a mere statue. Susan Eisenhower said that she was sorry to have used the term "bricks and mortar" when she meant to say "monument." As opposed to mere monuments, living memorials combine bricks and mortar with activity.

Senator Stevens said that he envisioned a "civilian Pentagon," a living memorial housed in a building where daily events are held.

Representative Moore remarked that both Senator Stevens and Susan Eisenhower appeared to have the same idea, and he liked it.

Susan Eisenhower stated that she and her co-presenters would definitely wish to be involved with such a memorial.

Chairman Siciliano observed that there are serious issues of financing and cost associated with living memorials and that the Commission would have to investigate these issues carefully. He cited the ongoing financial challenges faced by the Woodrow Wilson Center.

Susan Eisenhower introduced her co-presenters, who came prepared to describe the history, mission, and finances of their respective organizations.
The Chairman introduced Adrian Basora, president of the Eisenhower Exchange Fellowships (EEF), an organization whose purpose is international leadership development. Chairman Siciliano inquired about the funding and budget of the EEF. Mr. Basora explained that it was established in 1953 by a group of Pennsylvania leaders with private funds. Its current funding is primarily private, supported by an endowment established by federal trust funds. Mr. Basora then read a complete statement about the history and activities of his organization and offered a copy for the record.

The Chairman introduced Stewart Etherington of the Eisenhower Foundation who explained that the foundation was established in 1945 in Abilene, Kansas, to house World War II memorabilia. When these artifacts were turned over to the National Archives, the mission of the foundation was changed. It now supports a variety of services and projects. Mr. Etherington stated that a presence in the Nation’s Capital would greatly enhance the outreach of the foundation. The center at Abilene includes the Eisenhower boyhood home, the presidential library, and the family burial site.

Commissioner Geduldig stated that the session with the Eisenhower organizations’ representatives had been enlightening. He observed that no one on the Commission had envisioned just a statue or a building as fulfilling the mandate of the Commission. He added, however, that there is a danger of losing a direct understanding of Eisenhower’s actual accomplishments unless the Commission makes direct provision for this issue in its plans for the Eisenhower Memorial. He observed that part of the challenge confronting the Commission is to address the needs of young kids who have no idea whatsoever about Ike, and that the Commission’s mandate includes the task of bringing the memory and accomplishments of Eisenhower to the general public. He concluded by observing that we need our heroes.

Susan Eisenhower requested to add to her presentation some additional information about the Eisenhower Institute. She stated that the Institute was founded in 1983 after the closing of Eisenhower College. The Institute’s purpose is to carry forward the intellectual and public policy legacies of Dwight D. Eisenhower. At the present time the Institute is sponsoring programs in the following theme areas: “Building Local Partnerships;” “Safeguarding the Atom;” “U.S. National Security;” “International Cooperation in Space;” and “Democracy and Accountable Governance.”

Senator Inouye called attention to the increasing attrition of the World War II generation and the diminution of the general public’s understanding of World War II. He remarked that when he was first elected, the Senate had 95 World War II veterans, whereas only four veterans of World War II are now present in the Senate. A recent poll reported that less than 10% of high school seniors knew the significance of December 7, 1941 or could identify the significance of Normandy. He said that if the Commission’s responsibility is to perpetuate the memory of Eisenhower’s words and deeds, the result must be more than just a monument. He said that the Eisenhower family was right to ask for both a physical monument and a living memorial. He expressed his concern about the need to strike while the iron is hot. He proposed that the Eisenhower organizations develop a conceptual paper before the next meeting of the Commission. He also expressed his concern with costs, adding that the Woodrow Wilson Center is experiencing serious financial problems.

Chairman Siciliano observed that there is a limited time to take advantage of the influence that Senators Stevens and Inouye can exert on behalf of the Eisenhower Memorial. Representative Moore agreed that a concept paper is needed quickly.
Commissioner Eisenhower agreed with the observations of Senator Inouye. As a teacher of undergraduates, he noted a diminishing knowledge of historical figures among college students. Commissioner Eisenhower then raised a technical question regarding the 150-day time-frame for Area I certification: is it appropriate to seek such certification for a “living memorial?”

Mr. Parsons replied that such a certification request would be unusual. He stated that approval is site approval only, but the governing assumption for Area I is a memorial rather than a museum. He then returned to the issue of the 150-day period and said that the issue of whether the 150 days could be construed as 150 calendar days, rather than business (legislative) days, is an open question. Chairman Siciliano replied that he had not seen a legal opinion on the question. The chairman also observed that the certification issue as to site was entirely a separate issue. He reiterated his understanding that the Area I certification process does not encompass issues of memorial content.

Senator Inouye mentioned that he and Senator Stevens could take steps to introduce a resolution as an attachment to appropriate bills. He asked the presenters to submit their conceptual paper within the next two weeks and requested statements of support from the Eisenhower organizations.

Susan Eisenhower asked for clarification with regard to the nature of a conceptual paper to be submitted by multiple organizations.

Commissioner D. David Eisenhower replied that a joint conceptual paper with separate appendices submitted by the individual organizations could serve the purpose of the Commission. He also suggested that the theme of national growth be included in the legacy of the Eisenhower era, stressing the achievement of statehood for Alaska and Hawaii.

Senator Inouye expressed his sense of the Commission’s views at this stage: the Eisenhower Memorial should be physical but also acknowledge the “living” elements of the Eisenhower legacy.

Chairman Siciliano reiterated his concerns about financial viability and reminded the commissioners that the Woodrow Wilson Center, which has had major funding problems, has nothing significant in the way of a physical memorial to Woodrow Wilson. He also expressed the importance of family support to avoid a repetition of the problems encountered with the FDR memorial.

Abbott Washburn stated that, based upon his personal acquaintance with and knowledge of Eisenhower, he believed the President would be pleased to see a living memorial, which would provide for development of future leaders.

General Goodpaster suggested that the conceptual paper for an Eisenhower Memorial should draw upon the ongoing work of the Legacy Committee.

Chairman Siciliano briefed the Commission on the imminent relocation of the Commission’s offices.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.